

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

FILING DATE APPLICATION NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. CONFIRMATION NO. 10/637,608 08/11/2003 Patrick Flynn ENER-0001-4 2473 22506 7590 07/28/2004 **EXAMINER** JAGTIANI + GUTTAG LANGEL, WAYNE A 10363-A DEMOCRACY LANE FAIRFAX, VA 22030 **ART UNIT** PAPER NUMBER 1754

DATE MAILED: 07/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



## UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

FIRST NAMED INVENTOR ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. SERIAL NUMBER **FILING DATE EXAMINER ART UNIT** PAPER NUMBER **DATE MAILED:** This is a communication from the examiner in charge of your application. COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS This action is made final. A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire \_\_\_\_\_\_ month(s), \_\_\_\_\_\_ days from the date of this letter. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. 35 U.S.C. 133 Part 1 THE FOLLOWING ATTACHMENT(S) ARE PART OF THIS ACTION: 1. Notice of References Cited by Examiner, PTO-892. 2. Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. 3. Notice of Art Cited by Applicant, PTO-1449. 4. Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152. Information on How to Effect Drawing Changes, PTO-1474. Part II SUMMARY OF ACTION 1 - 4 4 are pending in the application. Of the above, claims \_\_\_\_\_ are withdrawn from consideration. 2. Claims\_\_\_\_\_\_ have been cancelled. 3. L Claims \_\_\_\_\_\_ are allowed. are rejected. are subject to restriction or election requirement. 7. This application has been filed with informal drawings under 37 C.F.R. 1.85 which are acceptable for examination purposes. 8. Formal drawings are required in response to this Office action. 9. The corrected or substitute drawings have been received on \_\_\_\_\_\_. Under 37 C.F.R. 1.84 these drawings are ☐ acceptable; ☐ not acceptable (see explanation or Notice of Draftsman's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948). 10. The proposed additional or substitute sheet(s) of drawings, filed on \_\_\_\_\_\_. has (have) been \_\_\_\_\_ approved by the

11. The proposed drawing correction, filed \_\_\_\_\_\_, has been approved; approved; disapproved (see explanation).

13. Since this application apppears to be in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in

☐ been filed in parent application, serial no. \_\_\_\_\_\_; filed on \_\_\_\_\_\_

accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

12. Acknowledgement is made of the claim for priority under 35 U.S.C. 119. The certified copy has Deen received not been received

examiner: disapproved by the examiner (see explanation).

14. Other

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121:

- I. Claims 2-14, drawn to a hydrogen composition, classified in Class 252, subclass 372.
- II. Claims 15-30, drawn to a method for detecting a hydrogen gas leak from a container, classified in Class 436, subclass 183.
- III. Claims 31-44, drawn to a method of making a hydrogen composition, classified in Class 252, subclass 372.

Claim 1 link(s) inventions I, II and III. The restriction requirement among the linked inventions is subject to the non-allowance of the linking claim(s), claim 1. Upon the allowance of the linking claim(s), the restriction requirement as to the linked inventions shall be withdrawn and any claim(s) depending from or otherwise including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) will be entitled to examination in the instant application. Applicant(s) are advised that if any such claim(s) depending from or including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) is/are presented in a continuation or divisional application, the claims of the continuation or divisional application may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application. Where a restriction requirement is

withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. § 121 are no longer applicable. See *In re Ziegler*, 44 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I and III are related as process of making and product made. The inventions are distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) that the process as claimed can be used to make other and materially different product or (2) that the product as claimed can be made by another and materially different process (MPEP § 806.05(f)). In the instant case the process as claimed can be used to make a materially different product, such as one which does not include all the detailed limitations as recited in claims 2-14.

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the process as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product, such as one which does not include all the detailed limitations as recited in

1754

claims 2-14.

Inventions II and III are related as process of making and process of using the product. The use as claimed cannot be practiced with a materially different product. Since the product is not allowable, restriction is proper between said method of making and method of using. The product claim will be examined along with the elected invention (MPEP § 806.05(i)).

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention:

- A selenium compound
- Methylamine or trimethylamine II.
- III. An oxygen compound
  - A nitrogen compound IV.
    - V. A sulfur compound.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. § 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, claims 1, 7-11, 15, 21-27, 31 and 37-41 are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An

argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) of the other invention.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classifications, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be

examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a petition under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wayne A. Langel whose telephone number is (571) 272-1353. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8 A.M. to 3:30 P.M.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stanley Silverman, can be reached on (571) 272-1358. The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either private PAIR or public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system,

Art Unit 1754

see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

WAL:cdc

July 20, 2004

Mayne A. LANGEL
WAYNE A. LANGEL
PRIMARY EXAMINER